DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 562 CG 016 588

AUTHOR Drummond, Robert J.
TITLE Impact of Reality Therapy on the Maine Youth Center. Fourth Assessment of Youth, Winter 1982.
SPONS AGENCY Maine Univ., Orono. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 43p.; For related documents, see ED 223 920, ED 223 941, and CG 016 587.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Attitude Measures; Behavior Change; *Counseling Effectiveness; *Counseling Techniques; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; Interpersonal Relationship; *Program Effectiveness; Psychological Needs; Secondary Education; Sex Differences; Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS Maine Youth Center; *Reality Therapy

ABSTRACT

The Maine Youth Center was established to rehabilitate juvenile offenders. The primary treatment philosophy at the Center is Reality Therapy, which stresses that individuals are responsible for their own behavior. To test the effectiveness of the therapy, major assessments of the youths were conducted at 6-month intervals in 1980 and 1981. The youths (N=229) completed five to seven instruments each testing period gathering demographic and attitude data. Analyses of results from the fourth assessment period indicated differences by sex and cottage with special units showing the lowest mean self-concept scores. Although there were no significant differences in self-concept or locus of control over the four time periods, the female unit tended to have residents who were more externally oriented. Overall, the youths tended to have a strong desire for contact with people. Perceptions of the correctional environment changed over time with the youths tending to perceive the program as being more practically oriented and the staff as more supportive. A series of 13 tables is included which presents survey results for all four assessment periods. (JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED228562

IMPACT OF REALITY THERAPY ON THE MAINE YOUTH CENTER

FOURTH ASSESSMENT OF YOUTH

WINTER, 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert J. Drummond

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Robert J. Drummond
Evaluator
University of Maine
Teacher Corps Project

Professor of Education
University of North Florida
Jacksonville, Florida

CG 016588

FORWARD

The purpose of this series of studies was to assess the impact of training in Reality Therapy by the staff on the youth at the Maine Youth Center. The training program resulted partially as a part of the Youth Advocacy Teacher Corps project conducted by the University of Maine at Orono. This is an interim report of the assessment of youth conducted in January of 1982. A time series design was utilized and this report focuses on the fourth major assessment of youth. The initial assessment was conducted in January of 1980 followed by assessments in May of 1980 and May of 1981.

The Maine Youth Center was established to rehabilitate children committed thereto as juvenile offenders by the courts of the state. The Center utilizes education, casework, group processess, psychology, psychiatry, medicine, nursing, vocational training and religion in order to help in the rehabilitation of youth. The primary mode of treatment or treatment philosophy adopted was Reality Therapy (Glasser, 1965).

Reality Therapy is a system which stresses that individuals are responsible for their own behavior. Excuses are not accepted for behavior such as the environment, heredity or the past. The individual is directed to look at the present not the past. Reality therapy is a method which helps persons develop confidence to handle responsibly the stresses and problems of life.

The system is designed to enhance the self confidence of the clients through the caring relationship of others. When individuals believe that others care about them, they can begin to build self confidence in themselves which in turn helps them fulfill their basic human needs.

Reality therapy stresses that everyone has to take the responsibility to look at what they want, at what they are doing and then evaluate their behavior in terms of what they want. They are then guided to make a plan to get what they want.

The youth are helped by the staff to apply through the eight steps of Reality Therapy. These are:

1. Make friends. Ask what do you want?
2. What are you doing now?
3. Ask: Is it helping?

4. Make a plan to do better.
5. Get a commitment.
6. Do not accept excuses.
7. Do not punish but do not interfere with reasonable consequences.
8. Never give up.

PROCEDURES

This section contains a description of the evaluation design, the instruments used, the procedures, and the data analyses selected.

DESIGN

A modified time series design was utilized. The youth were to be assessed approximately at six month intervals. Three major assessments have now been completed. The first was conducted during January of 1980. The second was completed during May of 1980 and the third during May of 1981. Two other assessments were conducted involving either one specific instrument or subgroup from the total population. The intent of the design was to assess the youth at different implementation stages of Reality therapy within the Maine Youth Center.

PROCEDURES

First of all the training procedures are briefly introduced and then the assessment procedures are discussed. The training program set up was a Double T model. A trainer, experienced in reality therapy, was hired initially to train a core of staff who then train additional staff members. These trainers participated in the certification training program conducted by the Reality

Therapy Institute in California. (A more detailed description of the training program can be found in Reality Therapy in Juvenile Corrections: A Staff Development Program by Mehnert, I. and Barnard, L., 1980). Teachers, cottage treatment staff as well as business and support staff were involved in the training.

The assessment instruments were administered to the youth by the director of psychological services and the director of cottage treatment services or staff members trained by these individuals. The examiners explained the purpose of the tests, the importance of the assessment and monitored the testing to see that the forms were being properly and seriously completed.

INSTRUMENTS

The youth were asked to complete five to seven instruments each testing period. Some of the instruments were not given each testing period but are rotated every other period. The instruments administered were:

1. A demogrphic data sheet	Asks questions about age, sex, educational level, length of stay at the Maine Youth Center.
2. Reality Therapy Activities Questionnaire (Drummond, 1980)	Includes the eight dimensions of reality therapy which have to be rated as to frequency of use by the youth.
3. Nowicki-Strickland (1972) Personal Reaction Survey (short form)	Contains 21 YES/NO statements measuring the locus of control, the degree of internal or external orientation of the respondents.
4. Coopersmith (1967) Self-esteem Inventory (short form)	Contains 25 items which are answered LIKE ME/UNLIKE ME covering the topics of peers, parents, school and self.

5. Correctional Institution Environment Scale (Moos, 1976)	Contains 36 TRUE/FALSE statements in the short form and 90 in the long form measuring nine dimensions of the social psychological environment of the correctional institution such as: Involvement, Support, Expressiveness, Autonomy, Practical Orientation, Personal Problem Orientation, Order and Organization, Clarity, and Staff Control.
6. Fire-B (Schutz, 1977)	Has 54 items in which individuals are asked to respond on a 6 point Guttman scale NEVER to USUALLY or NOBODY to MOST PEOPLE and assesses the subject's behavior on three dimensions: inclusion or the individuals need to have good or positive relationships and interactions with others; control or the behavior of decision making between individuals; and affection, the subject's need for loving and affectionate relationships with others.
7. The Jesness Behavior Checklist (1970)	Consists of 80 items rated from ALMOST NEVER to VERY OFTEN measuring 14 bipolar behavior factors such as Unobtrusiveness vs. Obtrusiveness, Friendliness vs. Hostility, Responsibility vs. Irresponsibility, Considerateness vs. Inconsiderateness, Independence vs. Dependence, Rapport vs. Alienation, Enthusiasm vs. Depression, Sociability vs. Poor Peer Relations, Conformity vs. Non-conformity, Calmness vs. Anxiousness, Effective Communications vs. Inarticulateness, Insight vs. Unawareness, Social Control vs. Attention Seeking, Anger Control vs. Noncontrol.

8.	The Sixteen Personal Factor Questionnaire (Form E) (Cattell, 1967)	Measures 16 dimensions of personality such as Reserved-Outgoing, Affected by Feelings-Emotionally Stable, Humble-Assertive, Sober-Happy go lucky, Expedient-Conscientious, Shy-Venturesome, Tough-minded-Tender-minded, Trusting-Suspicious, Practical-Imaginative, Forthright-Shrewd, Self-assured-Apprehensive, Conservative-Experimenting, Group-dependent-Self-sufficient, Relaxed-Tense, Undisciplined self-conflict-Controlled, Less Intelligent-More Intelligent.

The winter 1982 assessment utilized all the instruments listed except for the Reality Therapy Activities Questionnaire and the Jesness Behavior Checklist.

DATA

ANALYSIS

The responses of the subjects on each instrument were entered in a data set and scored utilizing the computational features of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, 1975). The names of individuals were coded prior to analysis. Frequencies were computed for items, subscores, and total scores for each of the scales. Comparisons were made by cottage. Analysis of variance was computed to test differences among the mean scores by cottage.

POPULATION

An attempt was made to assess the total group of residents at each testing time. The breakdown by cottage is presented in Table 1. Two hundred twenty-nine youth completed the assessment

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF THE MYC
POPULATION BY COTTAGE

COTTAGE	TESTING							
	JANUARY 1980		MAY 1980		MAY 1981		JANUARY 1982	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	22	12.6	29	16.0	30	15.1	32	14.0
2	24	13.8	27	14.9				
3	30	17.2	36	19.9	39	19.5	34	14.8
4	26	14.9	20	16.0	35	17.6	38	16.6
STU	4	2.3	0	0.0	12	6.0	12	5.2
6	20	11.5	11	6.1	26	13.1	32	14.0
7	19	10.9	15	8.3	8	4.0	23	10.0
FEMALE	19	10.9	23	12.7	16	8.0		
(2)							9	3.9
(9)							12	5.2
HAYDEN	10	5.7	11	6.1	10	5.0	13	5.7
8					23	11.6	12	5.2
N	(174)		(181)		(199)		(229)	

during January of 1982. The age distribution is presented in Table 2. The mean age across all four testing periods has ranged from 15.84 to 16.03 or approximately 16 years. The mode except for the second period has been 16 also. The median has ranged from 15.99 to 16.26. The typical individual at the MYC is 16 years of age.

Twenty-one youth were females who took the assessment in January 1982, 208 males. The percentage of females has ranged from 9.2 percent to 12.7 percent over the four periods while the male sample has consisted of 87.3 percent to 90.8 percent. The sex disbribution is reported in Table 3.

The distribution of the educational level of the Maine Youth Center population over the four testing periods is presented in Table 4. The group completing the last assessment reports themselves having a year higher grade attainment than the previous three assessments. The typical youth had previously been at the eighth grade level but at this testing at the ninth grade level. It is interesting to note that 8 of the January 1982 sample report that they have received their G.E.D. The distribution reflects in part more success in the education program at Maine Youth Center.

The length of stay at date of testing is compared in Table 5. The median length of stay across all four periods was four months while the mean was six months. The mode varied over times from 5 to 8 weeks to four months.

RESULTS

The results of the fourth assessment are discussed firstly in terms of how the data compare with previous assessments and

TABLE 2

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE MYC
POPULATION OVER THE FOUR TESTING PERIODS

AGE	JANUARY 1980 f (174)	JANUARY 1980 %	MAY 1980 f (181)	MAY 1980 %	MAY 1981 f (199)	MAY 1981 %	JANUARY 1982 f (229)	JANUARY 1982 % (218)
18	14	7.9	13	7.2	5	2.5	6	2.8
17	47	26.8	66	36.5	64	32.2	65	29.8
16	58	33.1	48	26.5	73	36.7	74	33.9
15	27	15.5	34	18.8	34	17.1	46	21.1
14	20	11.5	12	6.6	18	9.0	19	8.7
13	6	3.4	5	2.8	4	2.0	6	2.8
12	2	1.1	2	1.1	1	0.5	1	0.4
11	0	0.0	1	0.6			1	0.4
							(NR) 11	XXX
	MEAN 15.90		16.03		15.94		15.84	
	MODE 16.00		17.00		16.00		16.00	
	MEDIAN 16.05		16.26		16.08		15.99	

TABLE 3

MAINE YOUTH CENTER POPULATION BY SEX
AT THE FOUR ASSESSMENT PERIODS

SEX	JANUARY 1980 N	JANUARY 1980 %	MAY 1980 N	MAY 1980 %	MAY 1981 N	MAY 1981 %	JANUARY 1982 N	JANUARY 1982 %
FEMALE	19	11.0	23	12.7	16	8.0	21	9.2
MALE	155	89.0	158	87.3	175	87.9	208	90.8
MISSING					8	4.0		
N =	174		181		199		229	

TABLE 4

MAINE YOUTH CENTER POPULATION BY LAST GRADE COMPLETED

GRADE	JANUARY 1980 N	JANUARY 1980 %	MAY 1980 N	MAY 1980 %	MAY 1981 N	MAY 1981 %	JANUARY 1982 N	JANUARY 1982 %
GED							8	3.5
12	1	0.6	6	3.3			14	6.1
11	8	4.6	4	2.2	7	3.5	21	9.2
10	38	21.8	33	17.9	28	14.1	64	27.9
9	47	27.8	45	24.5	54	27.1	70	30.6
8	50	28.7	57	31.0	66	33.2	28	12.2
7	21	12.1	21	11.4	25	12.6	13	5.7
6	6	3.4	7	3.8	11	5.5	2	0.1
5 (under)	2	1.2	7	3.8	4	2.0	1	0.04
MISSING	1	0.6	4	2.2	4	2.0	8	3.5
MEAN	8.63		8.51		8.51		9.52	
MODE	8.00		8.00		8.00		9.00	
MEDIAN	8.66		8.46		8.36		9.19	

TABLE 5

LENGTH OF STAY AT DATE OF TESTING
OF THE
MAINE YOUTH CENTER POPULATION

LENGTH OF STAY	JANUARY 1980 N	JANUARY 1980 %	MAY 1980 N	MAY 1980 %	MAY 1981 N	MAY 1981 %	JANUARY 1982 N	JANUARY 1982 %
Less than 2 wks	8	4.6	19	10.5	12	6.0	6	2.6
2-4 weeks	13	7.5	10	5.5	20	10.1	27	11.8
5-8 weeks	23	13.2	19	10.5	31	15.6	38	16.6
3 months	22	12.6	17	9.4	35	17.6	23	10.0
4 months	9	5.2	26	14.4	19	9.5	22	9.6
5 months	23	13.2	18	9.9	15	7.5	14	6.1
6 months	10	5.7	6	3.3	7	3.5	17	7.4
7 months	5	2.9	8	4.4	9	4.5	11	4.8
8 months	9	5.2	9	5.0	7	3.5	14	6.1
9 months	4	2.3	9	5.0	9	4.5	13	5.7
10 months	5	2.9	7	3.9	2	1.0	11	4.8
11 months	5	2.9	3	1.7	3	1.5	4	1.7
1-1½ years	15	8.6	12	6.6	7	3.5	12	5.2
1½-2 years	7	4.0	10	5.5	12	6.0	3	1.3
Over 2 years	8	4.6	8	4.4	7	3.5	10	4.4
Missing	8	4.6	0	0.0	4	2.0	4	1.7
MODE	5-8 weeks/5 months		4 months		3 months		5-8 weeks	
MEDIAN	4 months		4 months		4 months		4 months	
MEAN	6 months		6 months		6 months		6 months	

then secondly, cottage differences are presented by instrument.

The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory was administered on three of the four testing periods. The mean in January, 1980 was 17.95, the mean in May, 1981 was 17.46 while the mean in January, 1982 was 17.77.

There are 29 items on the scale. The instrument is scored in the direction of positive self-esteem. The higher the score the more positive the self-esteem of the individual. There were no significant differences between the distributions or means over the three testing periods.

The cottage comparisons are given in Table 7. Previous patterns of differences were discussed in the past reports. There were cottage differences found also on the January, 1982 assessment. There were differences in self-concept between the two female units. Cottage 2 girls had a mean of 17.67 while cottage 9 girls had a mean of 12.67. The Security Unit and Hayden Unit had the lowest self-concept scores for the male group. Cottage 4 and Cottage 3 had the highest scores.

The Nowicki-Strickland Personal Recation Scale measuring Locus of Control was given each testing period. The comparisons of the January 1980, May 1981, and January 1982 scores are listed in Table 8. The overall means at the three periods are 6.36, 6.17 and 6.27. The scores on this scale can range from a low of zero to a high of 21, the scale is scored in direction of externality. Low scores indicate internal orientation while high scores indicate external orientation. In the past testings there was a tendency for females, younger youth, and those in the Hayden Unit to have

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF THE COOPERSMITH SELF ESTEEM SCORES
AT THE MAINE YOUTH CENTER

SCORE	JANUARY 1980		MAY 1981		JANUARY 1982	
29					2	0.8
28	3	1.7	2	1.0	3	1.3
27	1	0.6	5	2.6	8	3.5
26	8	4.6	7	3.6	9	4.0
25	9	5.2	13	6.8	11	4.9
24	10	5.8	6	3.1	16	7.1
23	9	5.2	5	2.6	12	5.3
22	6	3.5	10	5.2	13	5.8
21	14	8.1	13	6.8	15	6.6
20	16	9.2	14	7.3	13	5.8
19	10	5.8	14	7.3	17	7.5
18	7	4.0	10	5.2	14	6.2
17	14	8.1	10	5.2	15	6.6
16	11	6.4	15	7.8	16	7.1
15	7	4.0	9	4.7	15	6.6
14	10	5.8	10	5.2	8	3.5
13	8	4.6	7	3.6	9	4.0
12	9	5.2	12	6.3	4	1.8
11	4	2.3	3	1.6	7	3.1
10	5	2.9	10	5.2	6	2.7
9	3	1.7	7	3.6	4	1.8
8	3	1.7	3	1.6	3	1.3
7	2	1.2	1	0.5	3	1.3
6	3	1.7	2	1.0	1	0.4
5	0	0.0	1	0.5	0	0.0
4	1	0.6	3	1.6	0	0.0
MEAN	17.95		17.46		17.77	
MODE	20		16		19	
STANDARD DEVIATION	6.15		5.63		5.11	

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF COTTAGES
ON THE COOPERSMITH SELF ESTEEM INVENTORY

COTTAGE	JANUARY 1980			MAY 1981			JANUARY 1982		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
1	15.45	5.06	22	18.04	4.26	24	18.25	5.14	32
2	20.17	5.35	24	20.50	4.06	12STU	17.67	6.67	34F
3	19.03	4.97	30	16.49	4.99	39	19.23	5.29	38
4	19.15	5.75	26	18.56	5.39	34	21.32	4.62	12
STU	17.25	2.22	4	18.00	6.51	10H	15.67	3.90	31
6	17.90	3.33	20	15.36	5.26	25	18.03	5.43	23
7	18.16	5.21	19	17.00	5.45	8	17.61	4.22	24
8	14.42	5.88	19F	20.13	6.27	24	17.58	4.96	21
9	18.44	5.15	10H	13.50	6.65	16F	12.67	4.24	13F
							16.54	6.05	13H
TOTAL	17.95	6.15	174	17.46	5.40	192	17.77	5.11	228

TABLE 8

LOCUS OF CONTROL BY COTTAGE

COTTAGE	JANUARY 1980			MAY 1981			JANUARY 1982		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
1	5.18	3.15	22	5.93	3.56	30	5.91	4.20	32
2	6.67	3.18	24	6.17	3.61	12S	5.44	2.48	9F
3	5.70	3.64	30	7.00	3.53	38	7.28	4.34	34
4	5.59	3.30	26	5.74	3.87	34	3.95	2.58	38
5	3.67	0.58	4S	7.50	4.38	10H	6.75	1.92	12S
6	8.80	3.71	20	4.19	2.65	26	6.84	3.60	31
7	5.37	4.04	19	5.75	4.53	8	5.61	3.32	23
8	8.42	2.93	19F	4.80	3.71	25	5.67	3.25	24
9	6.10	4.91	10H	10.25	2.73	16F	9.50	2.47	21F
10							8.54	3.54	13H
TOTAL	6.36	3.75	174	6.17	3.56	199	6.27	3.54	228

higher scores or be more external in orientation. On the January 1982 testing, females in Unit 9 were the most external in orientation. They had significantly higher locus of control scores than the females housed in Unit 2. The Hayden Unit had the second highest locus of control mean, followed by Cottage 3. Cottage 4 had the lowest mean score and were overall the most internally oriented group.

The youth completed the FIRO-B on three of the assessments. The comparisons with the three testings and means of the norming group are found in Table 9. The FIRO-B is based on the assumptions that all human interaction may be divided into three categories: issues surrounding inclusion, issues surrounding control, and issues surrounding affection.

Inclusion is the need to establish and maintain a staisfactory relationship with people with respect to interaction and association. Control is defined as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people with respect to power. Affection is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with others with respect to love and affection.

There was a drop in the scores on WANTED AFFECTION over the three periods. The first two had high means, the third, a low mean. The youth were less concerned with love and respect issues. The highest score on the January 1982 testing was EXPRESSED INCLUSION. Youth feel the highest need to "associate, interact, mingle, communicate, belong, etc."

The lowest area of need was in the expressed control area. Behaviors relating to "power, authority, dominance, influence, control, ruler, officier, superior and leader "are not highly

TABLE 9
MAINE YOUTH CENTER
COMPARISON OF RESPONSES OF THE FIRO-B TO
NORMING GROUP OF SECONDARY STUDENTS

	FEMALE HS		MALE HS		JANUARY 1980		MAY 1981 MYC		JANUARY 1982	
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.
EXPRESSED INCLUSION	4.9	1.99	4.1	2.27	4.40	2.27	4.49	2.10	4.37	2.24
WANTED INCLUSION	4.9	3.44	4.0	3.22	4.35	3.31	4.20	3.28	4.30	3.08
EXPRESSED CONTROL	1.9	1.81	2.7	2.28	2.37	2.14	2.64	2.23	2.95	2.30
WANTED CONTROL	3.1	1.98	2.8	2.07	4.26	2.86	4.65	3.24	3.15	2.36
EXPRESSED AFFECTION	4.4	2.64	3.3	2.27	3.52	2.31	3.53	2.12	3.84	2.32
WANTED AFFECTION	5.0	2.54	3.6	2.49	8.29	2.10	8.06	2.00	3.38	2.39
	M		M		M		M			
INCLUSION	9.8		8.1		8.75		8.69	4.63	8.67	
CONTRCL	5.0		5.5		6.64		7.30	4.30	6.10	
AFFECTION	9.4		6.9		11.80		11.59	3.33	7.59	
TOTAL	24.2		20.5		27.19		27.57	8.67	22.73	
WANTED							16.91	5.72	10.83	

possible to the youth or valued highly. Negative control issues related to rebellion and resistance, and submissiveness are probably more characteristic of their behavior.

Overall the youth tend to have the strongest desire for contact with people regardless of who initiates it. They prefer not to be alone. They express least need for control. They are not as willing to give and take orders but yet they still prefer structure rather than a laissez-faire attitude. They tend to desire affection and warmth rather than impersonal, businesslike relationships.

The Cottage Comparisons on the FIRO-B for the January 1982 testing is reported in Table 10. (For previous comparisons please see the previous report). Note that when comparing female cottages, Cottage 9 has lower scores on all of the scales except expressed control.

In both female groups their expressed behavior scores were higher than their wanted behavior. More of their behavior was viewed as being actively initiated toward others. Cottage 9 girls had less desire to initiate behavior toward others than Cottage 2.

As far as EXPRESSED INCLUSION, Cottage 2 was highest, followed by Cottage 7 and Cottage 4. Cottage 8 had the lowest score; Cottage 1 the next lowest. On the WANTED INCLUSION scale, wanting to be included by others, Cottage 2 (girls) had the highest mean, Cottage 1 second highest and Cottage 4, third highest. The Hayden Unit had the lowest mean; Cottage 7 had the second lowest mean score.

The WANTED CONTROL, wanting others to control, the Security Unit had the highest score, followed by Cottage 6, and the Hayden

TABLE 10

COTTAGE COMPARISONS ON THE FIRO-B
JANUARY 1982 COMPARISONS

	1	2(F)	3	4	STU	6	7	8	9(F)	H
	(32)	(9)	(34)	(32)	(12)	(32)	(23)	(24)	(12)	(13)
EXPRESSED	4.03	5.77	3.97	4.84	4.50	4.41	4.87	3.96	4.75	4.15
INCLUSION	2.04	2.54	2.18	1.93	2.63	2.30	2.47	1.93	2.30	2.45
WANTED	3.78	3.23	3.21	2.21	4.08	3.97	2.61	3.46	2.17	3.85
CONTROL	2.96	2.97	2.14	1.54	2.06	2.22	1.80	1.89	2.34	3.00
EXPRESSED	4.58	5.56	3.56	4.66	4.42	3.31	3.13	3.17	3.08	3.15
AFFECTION	2.13	2.45	2.60	2.29	2.18	1.61	2.06	1.97	1.87	2.21
WANTED	5.09	5.56	4.24	4.97	4.00	4.03	3.83	4.75	4.67	2.69
INCLUSION	2.05	2.91	3.17	2.87	3.32	3.18	3.27	3.00	2.56	2.43
WANTED	4.19	4.11	2.74	4.74	3.78	2.50	3.09	2.37	3.42	2.77
AFFECTION	2.37	2.18	2.39	2.65	2.78	1.68	2.60	1.70	1.85	1.58
EXPRESSED	2.09	3.44	3.09	2.82	4.17	3.37	2.87	2.92	3.58	3.38
CONTROL	2.59	2.45	2.32	2.17	2.44	1.76	2.21	2.20	2.87	2.24

Unit. Cottage 9 (Female Unit) had the lowest score; Cottage 4, the next lowest. On the EXPRESSED CONTROL Scale the Security Unit had the highest mean score and Cottage 1 the lowest mean.

On the EXPRESSED AFFECTION Scale Cottage 2 had the highest mean and Cottage 9 the lowest mean. Both of these units consist of females. Cottage 4 had the highest mean of the male group and Cottage 7 the lowest mean. On the WANTED AFFECTION scale, Cottage 4 had the highest mean score while Cottage 8 had the lowest mean score.

The comparison of the youth's responses over five time periods are presented in Table 11. In January, 1982, the highest consenses were on the following items:

Residents are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things	92.6
Residents are encouraged to plan for the future	92.1
Youth are explained how youth center works	91.7
Facilities are always neat	85.6
Residents must follow schedule	85.6
Residents are encouraged to take leadership	85.2

Items which show an increase of agreement over the previous four assessments are:

Staff are interested in following up the youth once they leave.

Youth may criticize staff member to face.

Center usually looks messy.

Discussions on this unit emphasize understanding of personal issues.

Items which show a decrease of agreement from the previous assessments are:

Staff have very little time to encourage residents.

Staff give youth very little responsibility.

There is little emphasis on what residents will do after they leave.

Cottage differences for the January 1982 testing are reported in Table 12. There are marked differences between the different units, especially between the two female units 2 and 9. Overall Cottages 1, 4, 6 and 7 appear to be more positive about their environment than the Security Unit, Hayden and Cottage 8.

TABLE 11

CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION ENVIRONMENT
SCALE COMPARISONS 1980 to 1982
YOUTH

ITEM		MAR 1980 (150)	MAY 1980 (180)	NOV 1980 (53)	MAY 1981 (173)	JAN 1982 (229)
Residents proud of youth center	T	47.9	63.1	64.2	62.4	55.0
	F	52.1	36.3	35.8	37.6	45.0
Little time to encourage residents	T	32.2	27.0	30.2	31.8	20.9
	F	67.8	73.0	69.8	68.2	79.1
Youth encouraged to show their feelings	T	69.1	77.1	62.3	68.2	76.9
	F	30.9	22.8	27.7	31.2	13.1
Staff act on resident's suggestions	T	50.3	59.2	50.9	31.1	54.6
	F	49.7	40.8	49.1	65.3	45.4
Little emphasis on youth making plans for getting out	T	32.9	23.5	17.0	23.1	27.1
	F	67.1	76.1	83.0	76.3	72.9
Youth share personal problems with each other	T	61.9	70.6	66.0	60.7	62.0
	F	38.1	18.9	34.0	39.3	38.0
Facilities are always neat	T	86.0	89.4	90.6	91.3	85.6
	F	14.0	10.6	9.4	8.7	14.4
Staff sometimes argue with each other	T	43.2	30.7	60.4	56.1	52.0
	F	56.8	69.3	39.6	43.9	48.0
Residents must follow schedule	T	91.8	84.8	90.6	85.0	85.6
	F	8.2	15.2	9.4	15.0	14.4
Residents really try to improve	T	72.7	74.7	56.6	65.3	74.2
	F	27.3	25.3	43.4	34.a	25.8
Staff interested in follow up of youth	T	45.8	60.0	50.9	54.9	62.0
	F	54.2	40.0	49.1	44.5	38.0
Youth hide feelings from the staff	T	79.7	63.7	83.0	77.5	78.2
	F	20.3	36.3	17.0	22.5	21.8
Residents are encouraged to take leadership	T	76.5	91.5	90.6	93.1	85.2
	F	23.5	8.5	9.4	6.9	14.8
Residents are encouraged to plan for future	T				93.1	92.1
	F				6.9	7.9

TABLE 11 CONTINUED

ITEM		MAR 1980	MAY 1980	NOV 1980	MAY 1981	JAN 1982
Youth rarely talk about their personal problems	T	52.7	35.0	54.7	43.4	35.8
	F	47.3	65.0	45.3	56.6	64.2
Day room is often messy	T	33.6	19.8	30.2	35.3	33.6
	F	66.4	80.2	69.8	64.7	66.4
If program changed, youth told why	T	72.7	76.8	67.9	62.4	70.0
	F	27.3	23.2	32.1	37.6	30.0
Youth may critize staff member to face	T	44.0	40.1	45.3	31.8	47.6
	F	56.0	59.9	54.7	68.2	52.4
Youth care about each other	T	59.7	68.4	62.3	43.4	64.2
	F	40.3	31.6	37.7	55.5	35.8
Staff help youth get acquainted	T	78.7	80.1	64.2	74.0	74.2
	F	21.3	19.9	35.8	25.4	25.8
Staff and youth tell how they feel about each other	T	50.3	60.7	50.9	45.7	57.6
	F	49.7	39.3	49.1	53.2	42.4
Staff gives youth little responsibility	T	33.3	23.0	30.2	17.9	16.6
	F	66.7	77.0	69.8	81.5	83.4
Encouraged to learn new ways of doing things	T	82.6	87.6	86.8	93.6	92.6
	F	17.4	12.4	13.2	6.4	7.4
Personal problems openly talked about	T	48.6	53.4	49.1	41.0	49.8
	F	51.4	46.6	50.9	59.0	50.2
Center usually looks messy	T	47.7	37.3	54.7	55.5	62.0
	F	52.3	62.7	45.3	44.5	38.0
Youth explained how Center works	T	90.0	89.9	98.1	95.4	91.7
	F	10.0	10.2	1.9	4.6	8.3
Youth will be transferred if disobedient	T	69.8	59.3	47.2	53.2	62.0
	F	30.2	40.7	52.8	46.8	38.0
Little group spirit at MYC	T	45.5	36.2	39.6	37.0	40.2
	F	54.1	63.8	60.4	62.4	59.8
More mature youth take care of less	T	71.8	74.6	66.0	67.6	70.3
	F	28.2	25.4	34.0	32.4	29.7

TABLE 11 CONTINUED

ITEM		MAR 1980	MAY 1980	NOV 1980	MAY 1981	JAN 1982
People say what they really think	T	62.6	61.6	58.5	39.3	56.3
	F	37.4	38.4	41.5	60.7	43.7
Youth have a say about what goes on	T	51.7	43.8	28.3	20.8	43.7
	F	48.3	56.1	71.7	78.6	56.3
Little emphasis on what youth do after	T	48.6	38.2	35.8	35.3	32.3
	F	51.4	61.8	64.2	64.7	67.7
Discussions emphasize understanding persons	T	61.6	59.6	58.5	66.5	70.3
	F	38.4	40.4	41.5	33.5	29.7
MYC well-organized unit	T	66.0	68.5	55.7	67.6	56.3
	F	34.0	31.5	45.3	31.2	43.7
Staff are always changing minds	T	42.1	52.8	28.3	65.9	45.9
	F	57.9	47.2	71.7	34.1	54.1
Decisions about Center made by staff	T	56.4	55.1	60.4	68.8	60.3
	F	43.6	44.9	39.6	31.2	39.7

TABLE 12

PERCENT RESPONDING TRUE TO ITEMS
ON CORRECTIONAL ENVIRONMENT SCALE

ITEM	COTTAGE									
	1	2	3	4	STU	6	7	8	9	H
MYC residents are proud of this unit	56	89	38	82	50	56	91	13	33	31
Staff have very little time to encourage residents	19	11	21	8	17	31	13	42	25	23
Residents are encouraged to show their feelings	75	67	82	84	100	75	78	63	67	69
Staff acts on residents suggestions	38	78	59	76	17	47	87	21	75	46
There is very little emphasis on making plans for getting out of here	28	22	29	8	25	44	17	21	75	23
Residents are expected to share their personal problems with each other	59	22	71	84	75	69	52	38	42	62
Staff make sure that the unit is always neat	89	100	75	92	83	84	87	83	75	85
Staff sometimes argue with each other	22	22	62	63	58	47	52	58	92	46
Once a schedule is arranged for a resident, he must follow it	82	67	85	97	92	91	91	83	58	77
Residents here really try to improve and get better	72	89	65	84	58	81	74	71	75	69
Staff are interested in following up residents once they leave	69	78	68	71	83	47	61	25	83	62
Residents tend to hide their feelings from the staff	81	78	76	74	75	81	78	88	74	69
Residents are expected to take leadership in the unit	100	67	79	97	83	72	83	92	92	62
Residents are encouraged to plan for the future	100	89	100	97	92	84	74	92	100	85
Residents rarely talk about their personal problems with others	28	33	35	29	42	44	35	33	17	77
The Day Room is often messy	13	11	52	42	25	38	17	50	75	62

TABLE 12 CONTINUED

ITEM	1	2	3	4	STU	6	7	8	9	H
If a resident's program is changed, staff tells him why	75	67	65	74	75	72	78	54	75	62
Residents may criticize staff to their faces	44	33	38	42	67	69	35	42	75	46
Residents on this unit care about each other	78	78	59	82	67	59	74	42	50	31
Staff help new residents get acquainted on the unit	75	78	62	74	75	84	83	58	92	77
Staff and residents say how they feel about each other	63	89	53	66	42	69	49	38	67	46
Staff give residents very little responsibility	00	11	26	5	42	16	26	21	17	23
Residents are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things	97	89	88	97	100	94	91	92	92	77
Personal problems are openly talked about	53	22	32	66	75	59	57	21	50	54
The unit usually looks a little messy	47	78	74	55	33	63	39	58	92	69
When residents first arrive, someone shows them around	97	100	88	97	100	94	87	83	83	85
Residents will be transferred from this unit if they don't obey rules	38	100	53	68	67	53	91	54	83	62
There is very little group spirit on this unit	22	33	65	00	50	44	22	71	92	62
The more mature residents take care of the less mature ones	84	67	62	79	67	81	83	50	42	54
People say what they really think around here	47	78	59	42	50	56	57	63	83	69
Residents have a say about what goes on here	34	55	53	42	17	72	57	17	25	38
There is very little emphasis on what residents will do after they leave	25	11	29	16	50	38	39	42	50	46
Discussions on this unit emphasize understanding personal problems	75	89	53	92	83	75	70	33	67	69
This is a very well organized unit	75	44	24	87	75	69	87	21	8	46
Staff are always changing their minds here	19	55	68	16	25	63	43	67	67	62

TABLE 12 CONTINUED

ITEM	1	2	3	4	STU	6	7	8	9	H
All decisions about the unit are made by the staff here	63	44	53	50	83	63	57	79	67	54
Youth know what behavior is expected of them in school and cottage	94	100	100	100	100	94	83	100	100	62
The staff are consistent in the ways they work with youth	88	78	59	87	67	66	83	50	67	69
The program rules are clearly understood by everyone here	31	78	56	92	92	63	91	54	75	77
If a person fights with another member, he will get into real trouble	84	78	94	92	92	81	83	79	92	62
N =	32	9	34	38	12	32	23	24	12	13
										229

PERSONALITY PROFILE

The youth completed the 16PF test. The means and standard deviations of the youth are presented in Table 13. There were sex differences on six of the sixteen scales. Females tended to be more outgoing, warmhearted, easy going, participating than males. Males were less affected by feelings than females. Both groups tended, however, to be more toward the dimension characterized by emotionally less stable, easily upset.

Females tended to be more assertive, aggressive and stubborn than the males. Males, on the other hand, were more happy-go-lucky, impulsively lively, gay, and enthusiastic than females. Males tended to be more tough-minded, self reliant, and realistic than females who tended toward being more tender minded. The female group tend to be more suspicious, self-opinionated, harder to fool than males.

Females tended to have weaker superego strength than males. They were more expedient, disregarded rules, felt fewer obligations than the male group.

Both groups tended to be more toward the apprehensive, self-reproaching, worrying, troubled end of the continuum than the self-assured confident end of the continuum on Factor O. They also both tended toward group dependence rather than self-sufficiency. They were midway between self-assured and shrewd on Factor N. They were in the middle also between self-assured and apprehensive on Factor O, and the same position on Q_1between Conservative and Experimental. They tended to score more toward the Undisciplined self-conflict side of Q_3 rather than the controlled socially precise side.

PROFILE OF MALE AND FEMALE
YOUTH ON THE SIXTEEN PERSONAL
FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

	SCALE	FEMALE (21) MEAN	SD	MALE (208) MEAN	SD	
A	RESERVED-OUTGOING	3.60	.58	2.70	1.13	F M
B	LESS INTELLIGENT-MORE	3.75	.99	3.45	1.46	NS
C	AFFECTED BY FEELINGS-EMOTIONALLY STABLE	1.05	1.02	2.03	1.28	M F
E	HUMBLE-ASSERTIVE	3.55	1.32	2.59	1.09	F M
F	SOBER-HAPPY-GO-LUCKY	3.60	1.31	3.42	1.26	NS
G	EXPEDIENT-CONSCIENT.	2.85	1.31	3.80	1.42	M F
H	SHY-VENTURESOME	2.55	1.43	2.52	1.32	NS
I	TOUGH-MINDED-TENDER	2.80	1.60	1.58	1.16	F M
L	TRUSTING-SUSPICIOUS	3.35	1.15	2.81	1.18	F M
M	PRACTICAL-IMAGINATIVE	2.80	1.05	2.71	1.54	NS
N	FORTHRIGHT-SHREWD	3.05	.97	2.95	1.03	NS
O	ASSURED-APPREHENSIVE	3.35	1.20	3.00	1.18	NS
Q_1	CONSERVATIVE-EXPER.	2.80	1.12	2.83	1.01	NS
Q_2	DEPENDENT-S. SUFFIC.	2.75	.89	2.61	1.32	NS
Q_3	CONFLICT-CONTROL	2.05	1.28	2.31	1.20	NS
Q_4	RELAXED-TENSE	3.15	1.59	2.48	1.46	NS

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1. There are sex and cottage differences in the self concept of the residents. Special units have the lowest mean scores. There were differences between the mean scores for the two female units also.

2. There are no significant mean differences in self concept over the three time periods.

3. There are sex and cottage differences in locus of control. The Hayden Unit Cottage 9 (female unit) tend to have residents who are more externally oriented.

4. There are no significant mean differences in locus of control over the three time periods.

5. There was a significant drop in the scores on the wanted affection scale over the three periods on the FIRO-B. They tend to desire affection and warmth rather than impersonal and business like relationships.

6. The lowest area of need on the FIRO-B is the expressed control area.

7. Overall youth tend to have the strongest desire for inclusion or contact with people regardless of who initiates it.

8. More of the behavior of youth was viewed as being actively initiated toward others.

9. There are cottage and sex differences on the FIRO-B. In both female groups expressed behavior scores were higher than their wanted behavior. Cottage 9 girls had less desire to initiate behavior toward others than Cottage 2 girls.

10. The two items on the CIES having the greatest consensus were practical orientation items. These were: residents are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things (93%) and residents are encouraged to plan for the future (92%).

11. There were changes in the perception of the correctional environment over time. Significant dimensions showing an increase in consensus were:

Staff are interested in following up the youth once they leave (support)

Staff have time to encourage residents (support)

Staff give youth more responsibility (autonomy)

There is more emphasis on what residents will do after they leave (practical orientation)

12. There were sex differences in the personality profile of male and female juvenile offenders on the 16 PF questionnaire. Females were higher on scales A, E, I and L. Males higher on scales C and G.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Cottage differences on the instruments used are partially a function of the age and sex of the offenders as well as the implementation of Reality Therapy within each unit. Units previously rated as high implementers of RT tend to have higher mean scores.

2. The training in Reality Therapy was for staff. Staff were to implement the theory and practice. The impact can only be indirectly measured. The time series design also just included self report data and ratings by others and not other types of

procedures. Self-concept and locus of control are important dimensions related to the implementation of RT. The FIRO-B also measures personality dimensions that are related to the program. The CIES measures overall perceptions of the environment. The Teacher Corps projects had environment or climate as one of their thrusts.

3. Previous reports and research generated from the data has indicated that juvenile offenders who are externally orientated tend to have lower self concepts and more negative views of the correctional environment than those who are externally oriented (Drummond, 1982).

4. There are changing perceptions of the correctional environment of the youth over time. They tend to perceive major differences in the treatment dimension. They tend to perceive the program as being more practically oriented and the staff as more supportive. The program is viewed as having more structure. Youth might perceive it as being more authoritarian or staff directed but they desire more control by others. They are becoming more involved in the program and their perceptions of the relationship dimensions of the environment support this change. There is less emphasis on problem orientation in treatment and more on practical orientation. These changes in perceptions would reflect the influence of Reality Therapy on the treatment program at the MYC.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The cottage differences need to be evaluated by the personnel involved and translated into implications for further in service

of staff as well as for perscriptions for treatment strategies. For example, Cottage 9 girls tend to have low self-concepts and are externally oriented. Counseling strategies ought to focus on changing their locus of control and raising their self-concept. The Hayden Unit residents also tended to have low self-esteems.

2. Staff probably have a good general understanding of the principles of Reality Therapy. There is a need for a continuous in service program where more specific techniques are presented, discussed, and practiced for helping youth with specific types of problems. Sessions need to focus on skills to work with youth who have a) low self concepts

b) external orientation

c) aggressive behavior

d) low ego and superego strength

e) high anxiety

f) shy, withdrawn personalities

The program might need also to focus on other dimensions such as working with youth with drug problems.

3. It is evident that there is a widespread distribution of types and characteristics of youth within the center. Although Reality Therapy might be the official treatment modality, it might not always be effective. Some youth might not respond to the treatment modality. Their perceptual organization might not allow them to accept being helped or guided through RT. In setting up further inservice training, other modalities should be explored to help some of the specific groups who are not responding to the treatment.

4. Continuous evaluation of the treatment program is necessary. There should be studies completed to

a) identify those who seem to respond successfully to the treatment and those who do not

b) explore different ways of assessing the personality characteristics and types important to prescribing treatment modalities

c) follow-up the youth when they are on leave and evaluate program effectiveness.

Bibliography

Cattell, R. B., and Eber, H. W. Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Champaign, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1967.

Coopersmith, S. The Antecedents of Self-Esteem. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, 1967.

Drummond, R. J. Reality Therapy Activities Questionnaire. Orono, Me.: College of Education, 1980.

Glasser, W. Reality Therapy. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Jesness, C. F. Jesness Behavior Checklist. Palo Alto, Cal.: Consulting Psychological Press, 1970.

Mehnert, I., and Barnard, L. Reality Therapy in Juvenile Corrections: A Staff Development Program. Orono, Me.: College of Education, 1980.

Moos, R. H. Correctional Institutions Environment Scale. Palo Alto, Cal.: Consulting Psychological Press, 1974.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., and Brent, D. H. SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Nowicki, S., and Strickland, B. R. A Locus of Control Scale for Children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40, 148-151.

Schutz, W., Firo, B. Palo Alto, Cal.: Consulting Psychological Press, 1977.